APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,899	12/17/2001	Akio Watanabe	217205US2	7342

22850   7590   09/18/2008
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
RAMPURIA, SATISH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/18/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/015,899	WATANABE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SATISH S. RAMPURIA	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 July 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is FINAL.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *9-16,23,25-33,35-40,42-44 and 47-49* is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9-16,23,25-33,35-40,42-44 and 47-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date *06/24/2008*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is in response to the amendment received on 07/03/2008.

2.   The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 to claims 17 is withdrawn in view of Applicant's
amendment.

3.   Claims cancelled by the Applicant: 1-8, 17-22, 24, 34, 41, 45-46.

4.   Claims added by applicants: 48-49.

5.   Claims pending in the application: 9-16, 23, 25-33, 35-40, 42-44, 47-49.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 07/03/2008 have been fully considered but they are not
persuasive.

       With respect to claims 17, 23 and 25-31 rejected under 101, the response to arguments
regards to claim 17 is moot in view of applicants cancellation of claim. For claims 23 and 25-31
are still stand rejected. Claim 23 is directed towards an apparatus claim which recite the "means-
plus-function", however the limitations "…software recomposing section…reading inspection
progress…" can reasonably be interpreted as computer program modules/software per se as
explained in the rejection below.   The limitation "…software recomposing section… reading
inspection progress…" are only software steps as the specification or the claim does not recite
any hardware (e.g., memory or processor) components. Thus, claims 23 and 25-31 lacks the
hardware elements to tie the software steps as recited.

       (A) In response to applicants arguments with respect to claim 23 that Limon is simply

tests unit and does not teach "a software recombining section configured to recombining a

software of inspection use in accordance with a type of the object". First of all the language of

the claim is does not recite 'recombine'. Second no explicit definition is provided in the

specification for recombining software. Third, Limon teaches testing of circuit boards as

claimed. Limon teaches each circuit board is tested based on their test definitions (col. 2, lines

38-55) which are gathered to test circuit board. The test definitions are a plurality of PRG files

and plurality of MAC files. Each type of unit to be tested is associated with a respective PRG

file, which defines the sequence of test operations that are to be conducted on each unit of that

type. The PRG file may call one or more MAC files, in a manner somewhat similar to the

manner in which a subroutine is called by a computer program. Each MAC file can call one or

more other MAC files in a similar manner. There is no significant difference between a PRG file

and a MAC file. A PRG file is simply a MAC file which contains the top level of the test

definition, and each MAC file contains a portion of the test definition (col. 7, line 57 to col. 8,

lines 3). Thus, the system of Limon does disclose recombining software as shown above to

conduct the test.

(B) In response to arguments with respect to claim 42 as indicated in the rejection below

that the test unit includes a GPIB interface which interfaces with UUT (i.e., circuit board).

Further, Limon teaches visual display of input and output data passing through the GPIB

interface. The windows appear when the Tools Menu is used to toggle the associated feature ON,

and each disappear when the Tools Menu is used to toggle the associated feature OFF, i.e.,

shows the status of circuit board test (col. 20, lines 21-26). In response to arguments with

respect to claim 47, that Limon does not disclose repeatedly transmitting the prescribed command until the transient phenomenon terminated from said controlled device, as indicated in the rejection below that RS232 communication keep looking for a device to be connected as this feature is built in for RS232 interfaces (i.e., Hyper Terminal). In Limon transient phenomenon is communication between the UUT and the test station 23, once UUT 13 is connected to the test station, the test station inherently acknowledges the UUT and terminates the looking for the UUT commands i.e., as done in RS232 connection.

(C) In response to arguments with respect to claim 9, that Limon does not teach selecting of a circuit baseboard from the displayed list. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Limon system is capable of testing plurality of circuit baseboard to distinguish the board from one to another each board has a barcode label which provides information such as board number, serial number, part number (col. 6, lines 39-48). Thus, Limon does disclose the limitations as claimed. Claim 10 has similar limitation as to claim 9 and therefore the response to arguments with respect to claim 9 apply here as well.

Information Disclosure Statement

7.   An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449 filed on 06/24/2008 is attached to the instant Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9.   Claims 23, 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

        Claim 23 and 25-31 contain "means-plus-function" limitations. However, it is noted that the specification (paragraph [0031-0032] and [220] of the publication) does not disclose any specific corresponding structure or equivalents thereof. Therefore, these claim limitations can reasonably be interpreted as computer program modules/software per se. The claims are directed to a system of functional descriptive material per se, and hence non-statutory. The claims recite means for reading… displaying… setting… of the claims can reasonably be interpreted as computer program modules/software per se as disclosed in the specification (paragraph [0031-0032] and [220] of the publication). The claims constitute computer programs representing computer listings per se. Such descriptions or expressions of the programs are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer, which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable storage device encoded with a computer program is a computer element, which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the

rest Of the computer, that permits the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus

statutory. See Lowry, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent

No. 6,453,435 to Limon, Jr. et al. (hereinafter called Limon).

Per claim 9:

Limon discloses:

9. An inspecting apparatus for inspecting a performance of a variety of circuit baseboards,

comprising:

        a programmable logic device (PLD) (Here in Limon, there is no express teaching that

there is "*a programmable logic device*". However, since the workstation 41 of Limon includes a

processor 41 which has a logic built in to execute an operating system i.e., Windows 95, it is

reasonable to conclude that it would be obvious to one of skills in the art that the processor 41

has a programmable logic device that allow the processor to function as described above. The

system, of Limon is therefore the processor 41 which comes with a programmable logic device

to perform the UUT testing (col. 5, lines 42-59).

configured to inspect a circuit baseboard based upon a signal transmitted from the circuit

baseboard (*col. 2, lines 40-42 "a coupling portion operative to facilitate a detachable operative*

coupling of the test station to a unit to be tested" and col. 4, lines 61-63 "The test station 23

includes a tester connector 36, to which can be releasable coupled a UUT connector 37 that is

provided on tile UUT");

a file storing device configured to store a plurality of PLD files (*col. 2, lines 57-59 "a*

memory portion which stores a program and a test file, the test file containing a test definition

which specifies at least one test operation to be carried out by the test station through the

coupling portion");

a correspondence assigning device configured to assign correspondence of a PLD file to a

type of a circuit baseboard to be loaded with the PLD file (*col. 2, lines 57-59 "a memory portion*

which stores a program and a test file, the test file containing a test definition which specifies at

least one test operation to be carried out by the test station through the coupling portion");

a registering memory configured to store information of the correspondence (*col. 2, lines*

57-59 "a memory portion which stores a program and a test file...");

a displaying device configured to display a list of the circuit baseboards (*col. 3, lines 65-67*

"FIG. 3 is a diagrammatic view of a main screen provided on a visual display which is a

component of the test system of FIG. 1");

a determining device configured to determine a type of a circuit baseboard selected from

the list via the displaying device (*col. 6, lines 39-43 "The bar code on the label 117 provides*

information such as a board number and part number, and also a serial number. The board

number and part number have a one-to-one relationship to each other, and define a particular type of board"); and

a PLD file specifying device configured to refer to the correspondence information of the registering memory (*col. 2, lines 55-63 "a memory portion which stores a program and a test definition, the test definition including a first portion and a second portion, the first portion specifying a first test operation to be carried out by the test station through the coupling portion and the second portion specifying a second test operation to be carried out by the test station through the coupling portion"*) and specify an applicable PLD file based upon the circuit baseboard type (*col. 2, lines 66-67 and col. 3, lines 1-2 "wherein the program causes the processor portion to permit an operator to selectively specify one of a first operational mode and a second operational mode, and causes the processor portion to access and process the test definition"*); and

a loading device configured to load the PLD with the applicable PLD file (*col. 2, lines 55-59 "a coupling portion operative to facilitate a detachable operative coupling of the test station to a unit to be tested; a memory portion which stores a program and a test definition"*).

Claims 10-11 is the apparatus claim corresponding to apparatus claim 9 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 9 above.

Per claim 12:

The rejection of any one of claims 9 to 10 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

12. The inspecting apparatus according to any one claims 9 to 10, further comprising:

an item list displaying device configured to display a list of items to be inspected (*col. 6, lines 39-43 "The bar code on the label 117 provides information such as a board number and part number, and also a serial number. The board number and part number have a one-to-one relationship to each other, and define a particular type of board"*);

wherein said PLD file specifying device specifies an applicable PLD file in accordance with the inspection items selected from the item list (*col. 2, lines 55-63 "a coupling portion operative to facilitate a detachable operative coupling of the test station to a unit to be tested; a memory portion which stores a program and a test definition"*).

Per claim 13:

The rejection of any one of claims 9 to 10 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

13. The inspecting apparatus according to any one claims 9 to 10, further comprising:

an inspection item extracting device configured to extract an inspection item from a program file to be inspected (*col. 9, lines 33-36 "the archive file on the hard disk drive 28 of the server 16 will be accessed, and appropriate files therefore will be extracted from the archive file and downloaded to appropriate subdirectories 113 and/or 136-138 on the hard disk drive 52 of the test station 23"*);

wherein, said PLD file specifying device specifies an applicable PLD file in accordance with the inspection items extracted by the inspection item extracting device (*col. 9, lines 33-36 "the archive file on the hard disk drive 28 of the server 16 will be accessed, and appropriate files therefore will be extracted from the archive file and downloaded to appropriate subdirectories 113 and/or 136-138 on the hard disk drive 52 of the test station 23"*).

Per claim 14:

The rejection of any one of claims 9 to 10 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

14. The inspecting apparatus according to any one of claims 9 to 10, further comprising:

> a load completed PLD file determining device configured to determine if a prescribed PLD
>
> file has been loaded in a PLD currently performing inspection (*col. 18, lines 30-34 "When*
>
> *the system is processing a PRG or MAC file and reaches a command which has been*
>
> *designated as a breakpoint, the system stops and waits for operator authorization to proceed*
>
> *with processing of the breakpoint command"*); and

> an additional PLD file specifying device configured to specify at least one unused PLD
>
> file lacking for an inspection receiving circuit baseboard (*col. 7, lines 59-61 "Each type of unit to*
>
> *be tested is associated with a respective PRG file, which defines the sequence of test operations*
>
> *that are to be conducted on each unit of that type"*), based upon the determination of the load
>
> completed PLD file determining device when a different type of a circuit baseboard is to be
>
> inspected (*col. 10, lines 20-26 "the system displays information regarding the unit which is*
>
> *currently being tested. In particular, in region 161, the system displays an alphanumeric "Test*
>
> *Board" name for the specific type of unit currently being tested"*);
>
> wherein said PLD file specifying device reads a PLD file determined as lacking from the
>
> PLD file storing device (*col. 2, lines 57-59 "a memory portion which stores a program and a*
>
> *test file, the test file containing a test definition which specifies at least one test operation to be*
>
> *carried out by the test station through the coupling portion"*), and said loading device deletes a
>
> PLD file determined as being disused in the PLD (*col. 2, lines 55-59 "a coupling portion*

operative to facilitate a detachable operative coupling of the test station to a unit to be tested; a

memory portion which stores a program and a test definition ").

Per claim 15:

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

15. The inspecting apparatus according to claim 14, further comprising a log obtaining device

configured to obtain log information when said PLD is loaded with the PLD file (*col. 7, lines 54-*

56 "The LogFiles subdirectory 140 includes at least one log file, which is used to store the

results of certain test operations "), wherein said load completed PLD file determining device

determines if the PLD file has been loaded to the PLD of the inspection circuit based upon the

log information (*col. 9, lines 33-36 "the archive file on the hard disk drive 28 of the server 16*

will be accessed, and appropriate files therefore will be extracted from the archive file and

downloaded to appropriate subdirectories 113 and/or 136-138 on the hard disk drive 52 of the

test station 23 ").

Per claim 16:

The rejection of any one of claims 9 to 10 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

16. The inspecting apparatus according to any one of claims 9 to 10, further comprising a circuit

baseboard type determining device configured to determine sameness of successive circuit

baseboards, wherein the PLD used in the inspection for the former circuit baseboard inspects the

latter one when said sameness determination is positive (*col. 17, lines 19-23 "at block 246, the*

system checks to see if the UUT 13 passed all of the tests which were conducted on it. If so,

control proceeds to block 247, where the system turns on the PASS indicator 154, for example by

changing the letters "PASS" from a subdued color such as black to a noticeable color such as

green").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
 (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States
before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United
States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in
section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the
international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13.   Claims 23, 25-33, 35-40, 42-44 and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Limon.

Per claim 23:

Limon discloses:

23. A general-purpose inspecting system for inspecting an object connected to an input/output

interface using a command, comprising:

        a software recombining section configured to recombine a software of inspection use in

accordance with a type of the object (col. 2, lines 54-59 "a test station which includes: a coupling

portion operative to facilitate a detachable operative coupling of the test station to a unit to be

tested; a memory portion which stores a program and a test file, the test file containing a test

definition which specifies at least one test operation to be carried out by the test station through

the coupling portion"); and

means for reading inspection progress information related to the object during simulation,

said means for reading displays a resultant on a screen of a display unit (col. 3, lines 26-28 "an

output portion through which information can be communicated to an operator, the output

portion including a video display").

Per claim 25:

The rejection of claim 48 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

25. The system according to claim 48, wherein said means for setting and resetting is set in a unit

of a command used in the inspection (*col. 18, lines 30-34 "When the system is processing a PRG*

or MAC file and reaches a command which has been designated as a breakpoint, the system

stops and waits for operator authorization to proceed with processing of the breakpoint

command").

Per claim 26:

The rejection of either one of claims 23 or 25 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

26. The system according to either one of claims 23 or 25, further comprising means for

individually inspecting prescribed items based on an instruction (*col. 18, lines 30-34 "When the*

system is processing a PRG or MAC file and reaches a command which has been designated as

a breakpoint, the system stops and waits for operator authorization to proceed with processing

of the breakpoint command").

Per claim 27:

The rejection of claim to 25 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

27. The system according to claim 25, further comprising means for acquiring and means for

displaying inspection receiving data related to the inspection object on the screen when said

inspection is halted (*col. 18, lines 55-57 "In order to specify that a particular command is to be*

a breakpoint, the operator selects the line which contains that command, for example by clicking

on that line through use of the mouse 46 (FIG. 1).").

Per claim 28:

The rejection of claim 27 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

28. The system according to claim 27, further comprising means for changing said inspection

receiving data displayed on the screen based on an input (*col. 18, lines 55-57 "In order to specify*

that a particular command is to be a breakpoint, the operator selects the line which contains that

command, for example by clicking on that line through use of the mouse 46 (FIG. 1).").

Per claim 29:

The rejection of claim 28 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

29. The system according to claim 28, further comprising means for storing said inspection

receiving data in a storage device (*col. 2, lines 57-59 "a memory portion which stores a program*

and a test file, the test file containing a test definition which specifies at least one test operation

to be carried out by the test station through the coupling portion").

Per claim 30:

The rejection of claim 29 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

30. The system according to claim 29, further comprising means for replacing inspection

receiving data presently displayed on the screen with the inspection receiving data stored in the

storage device (*col. 3, lines 65-67 "FIG. 3 is a diagrammatic view of a main screen provided on

a visual display which is a component of the test system of FIG. 1"*).

Per claim 31:

The rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

31. The system according to claim 23, wherein said means for reading functions to debug and

analyze the inspection receiving data (*col. 17, lines 43-49 "debug mode is enabled... while a test

is being carried out...can be used to develop and/or debug a PRG or MAC file, or to make

temporary modifications to a PRG or MAC file for the purpose of isolating an elusive problem in

a particular unit being tested"*).

Claim 32 is the computer readable storage medium claim corresponding to system claim 23 and

rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 23 above.

Claims 33 and 35-40 are the method claim corresponding to method claims 23 and 25-30 and

rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-30 above.

Per claim 42:

Limon discloses:

42. A general-purpose inspecting system, comprising:

a controlled device configured to perform a prescribed function (*col. 3, lines 48-50 "a control portion which is operatively coupled to the coupling portion and the reader portion"*);

an interface section configured to indicate a status of the controlled device (*col. 3, lines 26-28 "an output portion through which information can be communicated to an operator, the output portion including a video display" and FIG. 7 and related discussion*);

a control processor configured to inspect the controlled device by transmitting a prescribed command to the controlled device (*col. 18, lines 30-34 "When the system is processing a PRG or MAC file and reaches a command which has been designated as a breakpoint, the system stops and waits for operator authorization to proceed with processing of the breakpoint command"*); and

means for determining in advance to transmission of the prescribed command (*col. 5, lines 65-67 "test station 23 also includes an optical power meter instrument 86, which has inputs coupled to the GPIB bus 8".*) whether an execution result of command processing (*col. 7, lines 54-56 "LogFiles subdirectory 140 includes at least one log file, which is used to store the results of certain test operations"*) will be abnormal (*col. 6, lines 4 "error detection portion 88"*) by accessing the interface section and acquiring information of status of the controlled device (*col. 5, lines 53-55 "workstation 41 includes a circuit 81, which is a General Purpose Interface Bus (GPIB) interface circuit, and which interfaces the workstation 41 to a GPIB bus 82"*).

Per claim 43:

The rejection of claim 42 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

43. The system according to claim 42, further comprising means for indicating the status of the controlled device by polling the interface section (*col. 18, lines 55-57 "In order to specify that a particular command is to be a breakpoint, the operator selects the line which contains that command, for example by clicking on that line through use of the mouse 46 (FIG. 1).") Note that from specification [0244] it was understood that polling is an interruption process.*

Per claim 44:

The rejection of claim 42 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

44. The system according to claim 42, further comprising means for indicating the status of the controlled device by causing an interrupt from the interface section (*col. 18, lines 55-57 "In order to specify that a particular command is to be a breakpoint, the operator selects the line which contains that command, for example by clicking on that line through use of the mouse 46 (FIG. 1).").*

Per claim 47:

Limon discloses:

Claim 47 (Previously Presented): A general-purpose inspecting method, comprising the steps of:

awaiting user input (*col. 12, lines 19-20 "system waits for the operator to… begin a test"*);

transmitting a prescribed command to a controlled device (*col. 12, lines 18-20 "once the operator starts the test (e.g., by pressing the Start Test button which sends command to start the test), control proceed to block 203"*);

causing the controlled device to execute processing the prescribed command (*col. 12, lines 20-21 "the system prompts operator to use the barcode reader (e.g., Start Test button causes the system to execute the command to prompt the user to scan the barcode or UUT)"*);

receiving a prescribed command resultant (*col. 12, lines 23-24 "the information (result) obtained from the barcode label"*);

displaying a content of the prescribed command resultant at a control processor site (*col. 12, lines 25-27 "the information (result) obtained from the barcode label… which the system will then display"*);

determining if a transient phenomenon occurs when a controlled device transmits acknowledge (*col. 4, lines 29-31 "FIG. 7, and two additional windows which each display information passing to and from a test unit through respective ports of the test system of FIG. 1"*);

repeatedly transmitting the prescribed command until the transient phenomenon is terminated from said controlled device (*col. 12, lines 28-30 "operator scans the barcode label…prompts the operator to couple the connector 37 on the UUT 13 to the tester connector 36 on the UUT 13" Here in Limon transient phenomenon would be communication between the UUT and the test station 23, once UUT 13 is connected to the test station, the test station*

inherently acknowledges the UUT and terminates the looking for the UUT commands i.e., as

done in RS232 connection"); and

awaiting user input after termination of the transient phenomenon (*col. 12, lines 30-31*

"prompts the operator to couple the connector on the UUT... and waits for the operator" Here

in Limon the transient phenomenon would be communication between the UUT and the test

station 23, once the UUT is connected to the test station 23 system waits for the operator").

Per claim 48:

The rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

means for displaying respective inspection items to be inspected on the screen in an order

of the execution (*col. 16, lines 47-51 "output successive messages to the workspace 151 of the*

main screen 146 (FIG. 3), to indicate whether each test operation conducted on the UUT 13 has

passed or failed"); and

means for selectively setting and resetting a breakpoint, said breakpoint halting

inspection of a corresponding item (*col. 18, lines 30-34 "When the system is processing a PRG*

or MAC file and reaches a command which has been designated as a breakpoint, the system

stops and waits for operator authorization to proceed with processing of the breakpoint

command"),

wherein the inspection operation configured to continuously inspect items one after

another is halted where the breakpoint is set by the means for selectively setting and resetting

(*col. 18, lines 30-34 "When the system is processing a PRG or MAC file and reaches a command*

which has been designated as a breakpoint, the system stops and waits for operator

authorization to proceed with processing of the breakpoint command").

Per claim 49:

The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated and further, Limon discloses:

displaying inspection commands on the screen in an order of the execution (*col. 16, lines 47-51 "output successive messages to the workspace 151 of the main screen 146 (FIG. 3), to indicate whether each test operation conducted on the UUT 13 has passed or failed"*); and

providing a plurality of object buttons in accordance with the inspection commands on the screen;

selectively setting a breakpoint in a prescribed at least one of object buttons (*col. 18, lines 30-34 "When the system is processing a PRG or MAC file and reaches a command which has been designated as a breakpoint, the system stops and waits for operator authorization to proceed with processing of the breakpoint command"*),

continuously inspecting items one after another; and halted inspecting at the breakpoint in the prescribed object button (*col. 18, lines 30-34 "When the system is processing a PRG or MAC file and reaches a command which has been designated as a breakpoint, the system stops and waits for operator authorization to proceed with processing of the breakpoint command"*).

Conclusion

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satish S. Rampuria whose telephone number is (571) 272-3732. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm Monday to Friday except every other Friday and federal holidays. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner/Software Engineer
Art Unit 2191

/Wei Y Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191